

*Comm
pending file*

PANEL MCD PAR FORMAT PROPOSAL

NEW PAR FORMAT PROPOSAL

INTRODUCTION:

The implementation of Banding for Panel MCD Officers in the Office of Communications creates a situation unique in the Agency with regard to the evaluation of employees. All other employees are, to some extent, competing against one another for a limited number of promotions. They are each rated, then put in a ranked order in which a top percentage get promoted based on headroom. Under Banding, all Panel MCD Officers not designated Category IV are eligible for at least one incremental increase per year, which is awarded based on their performance. Panel MCD employees are no longer evaluated against their peers, they are evaluated with regard to their job performance. Therefore the focus of the Performance Appraisal Report (PAR) must be to provide an in-depth evaluation of the employee's job performance as it relates to the job requirement. ?

CONCERNS:

Presently the supervisor assigns a numerical value to a Key Job Element, and then attempts to support the rating through the use of the narrative portion of the PAR. There are a number of weaknesses in this system, primarily having to do with inequities in the narratives, e.g.:

- a) Junior officers are often shown to be poor narrative writers, not having the experience or formal training in prose writing that senior officers may have.
- b) Differences in individual supervisors' writing skills can provide insufficient or misleading information, which affects the rating board's evaluation. The boards often are rating the narratives themselves rather than the employee, (i.e., A mediocre employee with a well-written, comprehensive narrative may be rated as well as an excellent employee whose supervisor could not or did not write as descriptive a narrative).
- c) The narratives, as written, are often not carefully aligned with individual Key Job Elements.
- d) Many officers already find it difficult to allocate the necessary time to prepare a good, comprehensive PAR narrative. Under Banding, the majority of MCD careerists will be evaluated within a compressed two-month time frame, further aggravating the situations cited above.

*This means
planning of
review time*

One further concern with the present format is that attributes such as leadership, training, and interpersonal skills are not directly addressed on the PAR by the first line supervisor, yet the reviewing panel, (which in most cases has had little or no contact with the employee), must make evaluations of those important factors.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The use of Key Job Elements as a method of breaking down employee responsibilities was first examined. There seem to be such a variety of key job elements, (approximately 20 were found on examination of only 6 soft files), that an attempt to group them into more generic topics (operations, support, etc.), would diminish the accuracy of the evaluation of the specific tasks being performed. The present method of assigning Key Job Elements (usually by component), seems to offer the most flexible and accurate breakdown of an employee's specific job functions.

It has already been asserted that leaving the justification of the numerical rating up to the writing of the narrative is not an equitable method of evaluating employees, however some justification for the rating must be given. So if the narrative is deleted, some mechanism for accomplishing that function must replace it. The factors that should be addressed by the supervisor are those given in the Personnel Management Handbook. These factors are:

Productivity: The degree to which the individual satisfies standards for accuracy, quality, completeness, and timeliness with minimum supervision.

Judgment: The degree to which the individual makes sound recommendations and effective decisions.

Creativity/Innovation: The degree to which the individual identifies, develops, and expresses innovative, practical alternatives and solutions to problems.

Initiative: The degree to which the individual identifies a need and organizes, devises, and undertakes action.

*are standards
devised?*

Self-expression: The degree of effectiveness of the individual's written and oral communication on substantive matters.

Placing these evaluating factors next to each Key Job Element forces the supervisor to take each factor into account for every Key Job Element, giving him a factual basis for an accurate, comprehensive rating. When the supervisor gets to the overall rating, he is further assisted by the visual impact of where the preponderance of the checkmarks are.

The addition of the Personal Attributes and Abilities section is to assist the component panels in their evaluations of the employees. Those evaluations at present are based almost wholly on the narratives, because in many cases the panel members have had little or no contact with the employee. The responsibility for evaluating those elements in the new format has been delegated to the employee's immediate supervisor, as he is the individual with ongoing personal contact with the employee and is best qualified to judge.

On the proposed PAR format the overall narrative is replaced by short statements about each Key Job Element. These statements should address any criteria rating that needs amplification. (It should be noted that these explanations will be brief statements. Narrative style writing and attachments are discouraged).

Under Banding a precise rank order list of the employees (as exists presently), will not be needed, because the emphasis is not on "promotions" as such, but instead on incremental increases for different levels of performance. Therefore, there is less of a need to spread the curve out through the use of the 1 thru 7 scale presently used. Additionally there is a certain amount of grade inflation present in the PAR system which would be eliminated if a conversion were made to another scale. The new scale is

simple in its use of descriptors, with the hope that the words themselves will assist in accurate ratings of the Key Job Elements. Hopefully the simplicity of the scale will inhibit future grade inflation.

The descriptors themselves were chosen for their inherent meanings, and should be applied as directly as possible to each factor. The specific definitions of the descriptors are as follows:

- a) Unsatisfactory: Performance is inadequate to meet normal work standards.
- b) Acceptable: Performance is meeting normal work standards.
- c) Good: Performance exceeds normal work standards.
- d) Excellent: Performance is well in excess of normal work standards.
- e) Superior: Performance is of the highest quality and sets the highest standards for the position.

what are normal work standards?

It should be noted that employees at Band Level IV have responsibilities that are complex and varied enough to require a narrative type of evaluation. At that level it is also assumed that the rating officer would have the ability to write a comprehensive PAR narrative. Therefore it is suggested that Level IV MCD employees continue to use the present PAR form.

CONCLUSION:

The proposed PAR format complies with the spirit of the DCI's directive of 23 March, 1984 to the DDA on the subject of the Pursuit of Excellence. That directive includes; delegating authority and responsibility to the lowest levels possible, providing feedback, and fostering better communication in all directions.

The implementation of Banding for Panel MCD Officers introduces a merit pay system to those employees, to compensate those officers for their level of performance. The proposed PAR format assists the supervisors in evaluating their employees based on consistent, specific criteria. In addition, important criteria, (i.e., leadership, creativity, dedication, etc.), would be addressed for the first time by the immediate supervisor.

CONFIDENTIAL
(When Filled In)

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL REPORT												
SECTION A GENERAL INFORMATION												
1. SOC SEC NUMBER	2. NAME (Last, First, Middle)	3. DATE OF BIRTH	4. SD	5. SCHED	6. GRADE							
7. AFFILIATION		8. OCCUPATIONAL TITLE										
9. OFFICE/DIVISION/BRANCH OF ASSIGNMENT		10. CURRENT STATION			11. HQS.							
12. REPORTING PERIOD		13. DATE REPORT DUE IN OP		14. TYPE OF REPORT								
SECTION B PERFORMANCE RATINGS												
Rating UNSATISFACTORY: Performance is inadequate to meet normal work standards. ACCEPTABLE: Performance is meeting normal work standards. GOOD: Performance exceeds normal work standards. EXCELLENT: Performance is well in excess of normal work standards. SUPERIOR: Performance is of the highest quality and sets new standards for the position. NOT APPLICABLE: To be used if the factor does not bear on the Key Job Element.						Unsatisfactory 1 Acceptable 2 Good 3 Excellent 4 Superior 5 Not Applicable						
KEY JOB ELEMENTS												
KEY JOB ELEMENT NO. 1						PRODUCTIVITY						
						JUDGEMENT						
						CREATIVITY/INNOVATION						
						INITIATIVE						
						SELF EXPRESSION						
						EXPLANATION, IF NEEDED:						
						OVERALL						
KEY JOB ELEMENT NO. 2						PRODUCTIVITY						
						JUDGEMENT						
						CREATIVITY/INNOVATION						
						INITIATIVE						
						SELF EXPRESSION						
						EXPLANATION, IF NEEDED:						
						OVERALL						
KEY JOB ELEMENT NO. 3						PRODUCTIVITY						
						JUDGEMENT						
						CREATIVITY/INNOVATION						
						INITIATIVE						
						SELF EXPRESSION						
						EXPLANATION, IF NEEDED:						
						OVERALL						
KEY JOB ELEMENT NO. 4						PRODUCTIVITY						
						JUDGEMENT						
						CREATIVITY/INNOVATION						
						INITIATIVE						
						SELF EXPRESSION						
						EXPLANATION, IF NEEDED:						
						OVERALL						
OVERALL												

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL
(When Filled In)

SECTION B (continued)		PERFORMANCE RATINGS					
Rating		Unsatisfactory	Acceptable	Good	Excellent	Superior	Not Applicable
		1	2	3	4	5	
UNSATISFACTORY: Performance is inadequate to meet normal work standards. ACCEPTABLE: Performance is meeting normal work standards. GOOD: Performance exceeds normal work standards. EXCELLENT: Performance is well in excess of normal work standards. SUPERIOR: Performance is of the highest quality and sets new standards for the position. NOT APPLICABLE: To be used if the factor does not bear on the Key Job Element.							
KEY JOB ELEMENTS							
KEY JOB ELEMENT NO. 5							
	PRODUCTIVITY						
	JUDGEMENT						
	CREATIVITY/ INNOVATION						
	INITIATIVE						
	SELF EXPRESSION						
EXPLANATION, IF NEEDED:							
		OVERALL					
KEY JOB ELEMENT NO. 6							
	PRODUCTIVITY						
	JUDGEMENT						
	CREATIVITY/ INNOVATION						
	INITIATIVE						
	SELF EXPRESSION						
EXPLANATION, IF NEEDED:							
		OVERALL					
KEY JOB ELEMENT NO. 7							
	PRODUCTIVITY						
	JUDGEMENT						
	CREATIVITY/ INNOVATION						
	INITIATIVE						
	SELF EXPRESSION						
EXPLANATION, IF NEEDED:							
		OVERALL					
PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES AND ABILITIES							
LEADERSHIP – The degree to which this individual influences, inspires, motivates others.							
EXPLANATION, IF NEEDED:							
INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS – The degree to which this individual relates to and works with subordinates, peers and supervisors.							
EXPLANATION, IF NEEDED:							
TRAINING – The degree of interest expressed by this individual in intellectual and professional growth through self study, OJT and formal training during the period evaluated.							
EXPLANATION, IF NEEDED:							
DEDICATION – The degree of this individual's level of commitment to the task at hand.							
EXPLANATION, IF NEEDED:							
OVERALL PERFORMANCE RATING LEVEL							
Taking everything into account about the employee which influences his/her effectiveness on the job, I rate the employee's overall performance at this level.							

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL
(When Filled In)

SECTION C		COMMENTS	
Supervisor			
Months employee has been in this position _____	Months employee has been under my supervision _____	Interim discussion was _____ was not _____ held.	Reason for NOT showing employee the report is attached. Yes _____ No _____
DATE	TITLE	TYPED OR PRINTED NAME AND SIGNATURE	
Employee Certification			
I have reviewed my supervisor's comments and discussed my job performance ratings with him/her. My signature does not necessarily imply my agreement with either.		DATE	TYPED OR PRINTED NAME AND SIGNATURE
Reviewing Official			
DATE	POSITION TITLE	TYPED OR PRINTED NAME AND SIGNATURE	
Employee Certification			
I have read my reviewing official's comments. My signature does not necessarily imply my agreement with them.		I have _____ have not _____ attached a statement containing my comments about this Performance Appraisal Report.	
DATE	POSITION TITLE	TYPED OR PRINTED NAME AND SIGNATURE	
SECTION D		QUALIFICATIONS UPDATE	
Qualifications Update (Form 444n) is _____ is not _____ attached. (Submit only if there are changes.)			

CONFIDENTIAL